



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/408,112	09/29/1999	JEFFREY G. WHITE LA W	245/282	3606

34313 7590 07/30/2003

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
4 PARK PLAZA
SUITE 1600
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558

EXAMINER

HOYE, MICHAEL W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/408,112

Applicant(s)

WHITELAW, JEFFREY G.

Examiner

Michael W. Hoye

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on April 28, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that, "Kim does not disclose, teach or suggest that the user can select a "TABLE" option and, while in the Table, "simply select a **preset** rating (e.g. TV-14), which includes **both a rating** (TV-14) **and a subject matter category** (V, L, S, D)."

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant because Kim clearly discloses in col. 6, lines 1-2 that, "Ratings of the television guidelines menu are classified according to age and television program's contents." In col. 6, lines 4-7, Kim continues, "If the television guidelines menu is selected, the user can select one rating from the following ratings: TABLE, TV-Y, TV-Y7, TV-G, TV-PG and TV-14, while circulating through these ratings (step S230)." In addition to, Kim discloses a flowchart in Fig. 5, which shows in S230 and S232 that the user must eventually select the "TABLE" option in order to proceed within the TV Rating/Television guidelines menu, otherwise the process will continue looping in S230 & S232 (col. 6, lines 8-20). When the "TABLE" option is selected (col. 6, line 8) and a table is displayed as shown in Fig. 11 (which may have similar or different settings), the user may set a rating code (S236, Fig. 5 & col. 6, lines 13-17). The overall rating code or "preset specification set" as shown in Fig. 11 comprises ratings (rating code according to the age of the viewers in the vertical axis) and a subject matter category (rating code according to the contents of the program in the horizontal axis). Each of the preset age rating codes (TV-Y, TV-Y7, TV-G, TV-PG, TV-

Art Unit: 2614

14 and TV-MA) has a corresponding level of multiple content rating codes (FV, V, S, L, and D), and any one of, some of, or all of the age rating and content rating codes may be selected to be set for blocking. The user may setup one or more macro function key(s), which stores preset rating codes, whereby the user may select one or more of the preset content-based specification sets.

Applicant's argument that, "Claim 1 includes the step of "selecting one of one or more preset content based specification sets previously stored by the manufacturer in permanent memory with the consumer electronics device, each of the one or more preset specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category." Kim, in contrast, discloses nothing more than that provide in the prior art..." with respect to the rejection of claims 1-7, 9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made for claims 1-7, 9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (USPN 5,995,133). Kim discloses a method for changing a rating code with a macro function key and a receiving apparatus having a function for blocking out a program accordingly (col. 3, lines 49-51 & col. 4, lines 20-23), a preset rating code (col. 4, line 52) and memory 18, that may consist of a non-volatile memory for storing the rating code (col. 4, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kim such that one or more preset content based specification sets [would have been] previously stored by the manufacturer in permanent memory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to make such a modification since many consumer electronics devices come manufactured with

Art Unit: 2614

present content-based specification sets already stored in permanent memory, such as a ROM, EEPROM, or other type of permanent memory.

As to claim 13, the Applicant argues that, "Kim also does not disclose, teach or suggest "permanent recordable media for a consumer electronics device.""

In response to applicant's arguments, Kim discloses a memory component where the rating codes are stored, which is either "random access memory or non-volatile memory" (column 4, lines 24-25). The memory is an integral part of the device and is therefore permanent.

As to claims 13-18, the applicant argues that, "Claim 13 includes "one or more preset content-based specification sets preset by the manufacturer, each ... comprising a rating and a subject matter category" and a computer program including the step of "selecting one of the one or more preset contact-based specification sets." [And that] In Kim, that rating and content codes are stored separately and are separately retrievable from memory.""

In response to the rejection of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made for claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (USPN 5,995,133), see similar arguments made above in claim 1.

As to claims 20-28, the applicant argues that, "Collings does not disclose, teach or suggest "a consumer electronics device having "V-chip" circuitry for supervising personal exposure to user discernible information.""

Art Unit: 2614

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "a consumer electronics device having "V-chip" circuitry for supervising personal exposure to user discernible information." has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Applicant's argument that, "Collings does not disclose, teach or suggest "permanent nonvolatile memory comprising one or more preset content-based specification sets preset by the manufacturer, each of the preset content-based specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category." with respect to the rejection of claims 20 and 21-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made for claims 20-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collings (USPN 5,828,402). Collings discloses a non-volatile memory 58 for storing one or more preset content-based specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category (see col. 17, lines 33 – col. 18, line 4). Collings does not explicitly disclose the one or more preset content-based specification sets are preset by the manufacturer. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Collings such that one or more preset content-based specification sets [would have been] preset by the manufacturer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to make such a modification since many consumer

Art Unit: 2614

electronics devices come manufactured with present content-based specification sets already stored in permanent memory, such as a ROM, EEPROM, or other type of permanent memory.

As to claims 8, 10 and 19, the applicant argues that, "As noted above, Kim fails to disclose, teach or suggest:

Permanently storing one or more preset content-based specification sets within the consumer electronics device, each of the one or more preset specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category;
as claimed in claim 1 or

One or more preset content-based specification sets, each of the one or more preset specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category;
as claimed in claim 13."

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant as already noted above in the responses for claims 1 and 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 29-32, 34-36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abecassis (USPN 5,684,918), cited by the examiner.

Art Unit: 2614

As to claim 29, note the Abecassis reference which discloses a method of supervising personal exposure to a consumer electronics device. The claimed accessing a menu system stored in permanent memory...is met by Figs. 4D and 4E, as well as other menu display screens disclosed, and non-volatile resident memory (col. 22, lines 24-27). The claimed menu system including a menu comprising a first selection for accessing a preset criteria menu is met by viewer selection 445 as shown in Fig. 4D, and the claimed second selection for accessing a custom criteria menu is met by content selection 444 as shown in Fig. 4D. The claimed preset criteria menu includes one or more selections corresponding to preset content-based specification sets stored in permanent memory is met by selections 433 in Fig. 4D, which include Dad, Mom, Teen, and Child as shown. The claimed each of the preset specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category is met by Fig. 4B, where the viewer may initially set the level of explicitness or rating in a number of different categories or subject matter (see col. 16, lines 25-54). The claimed custom criteria menu includes a plurality of selections corresponding to ratings and subject matter categories individually stored in permanent memory is met by the plurality of selections corresponding to ratings from 1 to 4 (none to graphic) and subject matter categories such as bloodshed, nudity, sex and violence, as shown in Fig. 4E. The user may select the first selection by selecting a viewer key 445 (Fig. 4D) and access the preset criteria menu; then select a first preset criteria such as selecting child (Fig. 4D) and storing the first preset criteria in memory as a current content-based specification set by pressing the SEL key (key 434 in Fig. 4D, see col. 17, lines 52-56).

As to claim 30, the claimed receiving a program signal suitable for conversion by the consumer electronics device into user discernible information is met by the communications

Art Unit: 2614

module 502, the video sound module or board 506, and the video processor 513 in Fig. 5 (col. 18, line 60 – col. 19, line 5 & col. 20, lines 40-45). The claimed receiving a content-based indicator set indicative of a rating and a subject matter category of the program signal is met by the coding that is assigned to video (see col. 7, line 51 – col. 8, line 3 and lines 30-40) and received at the viewer interface shown in Fig. 5 as described above. The claimed comparing the current content-based specification set with the received content-based indicator set and impairing the program signal based on the comparison is met by a user setting the desired level and the device impairs content above the set level (col. 18, lines 1-6).

As to claim 31, the claimed received content –based indicator set is carried by the program signal is met by assigning a content code to a segment of video (col. 7, lines 51-53).

As to claim 32, the claimed program signal is impaired if the received content-based indicator set transgresses the current content-based specification set is met as described above in claim 30.

As to claim 34, Abecassis discloses that the rating of the respective sets may additionally or alternatively incorporate the MPAA's movie rating system (col. 8, lines 30-40).

As to claim 35, Abecassis discloses that the subject matter category of the respective preset content-based specification and content-based indicator sets include violence, profanity or Adult Language, and sex or sexual situations (see Figs. 1A, 4B and 4E).

As to claim 36, Abecassis discloses a plurality of preset content-based specification sets as shown in Fig. 4F, such as Movies, News, Shopping, Sports, etc...

Art Unit: 2614

As to claim 39, the claimed selection of the preset content-based specification set is effected in response to entry of a valid passcode is met by having to enter a valid passcode for access to a viewer's video services that are password protected (see col. 17, lines 30-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9 and 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (USPN 5,995,133), cited by the examiner.

As to claims 1 and 2, the Kim reference discloses a method for blocking out programs according to a viewer's preferences. "Preset rating" codes (column 2, line 8) such as "Television Guidelines" (column 5, line 48) and "Motion Picture Guidelines" (column 5, line 50) are permanently stored in the device, comprising of a rating and a subject matter category (Figures 11, 12, 16). A "receiving section" (column 2, line 41) receives the program signal and outputs audio and video via the "audio circuit" (column 2, line 44) and "video circuit" (column 2, line 46), while a decoder outputs a "rating code" (column 2, line 50) retrieved from the program's "rating signal" (column 2, line 48). A user can "select" (column 5, line 56) a rating code that is compared with the program's read out rating code via the "control section" (column 2, line 51), which "executes an operation for blocking out the program" (column 5, lines 64-65) according to this comparison. Moreover, Kim clearly discloses in col. 6, lines 1-2 that, "Ratings of the

Art Unit: 2614

television guidelines menu are classified according to age and television program's contents." In col. 6, lines 4-7, Kim continues, "If the television guidelines menu is selected, the user can select one rating from the following ratings: TABLE, TV-Y, TV-Y7, TV-G, TV-PG and TV-14, while circulating through these ratings (step S230)." In addition to, Kim discloses a flowchart in Fig. 5, which shows in S230 and S232 that the user must eventually select the "TABLE" option in order to proceed within the TV Rating/Television guidelines menu, otherwise the process will continue looping in S230 & S232 (col. 6, lines 8-20). When the "TABLE" option is selected (col. 6, line 8) and a table is displayed as shown in Fig. 11 (which may have similar or different settings), the user may set a rating code (S236, Fig. 5 & col. 6, lines 13-17). The overall rating code or "preset specification set" as shown in Fig. 11 comprises ratings (rating code according to the age of the viewers in the vertical axis) and a subject matter category (rating code according to the contents of the program in the horizontal axis). Each of the preset age rating codes (TV-Y, TV-Y7, TV-G, TV-PG, TV-14 and TV-MA) has a corresponding level of multiple content rating codes (FV, V, S, L, and D), and any one of, some of, or all of the age rating and content rating codes may be selected to be set for blocking. The user may setup one or more macro function key(s), which stores preset rating codes, whereby the user may select one or more of the preset content-based specification sets. Kim discloses a method for changing a rating code with a macro function key and a receiving apparatus having a function for blocking out a program accordingly (col. 3, lines 49-51 & col. 4, lines 20-23), a preset rating code (col. 4, line 52) and memory 18, that may consist of a non-volatile memory for storing the rating code (col. 4, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kim such that one or more preset content based specification sets

Art Unit: 2614

[would have been] previously stored by the manufacturer in permanent memory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to make such a modification since many consumer electronics devices come manufactured with present content-based specification sets already stored in permanent memory, such as a ROM, EEPROM, or other type of permanent memory.

As to claim 3, the reference discloses that “if the rating code of the received program is out of scope of the preset rating code” (columns 6-7, lines 66-1), the audio and video outputs are blocked out.

As to claims 4-6, the reference clearly discloses television ratings, movie ratings, and one of the subject matter categories of FV, D, L, S, and V (see Figures 11-13, 16, and column 6, lines 6-7, 26).

As to claim 7, the reference clearly discloses a plurality of preset content-based specification sets such as “Television Guidelines”, “Movie Guidelines”, and “Unrated Programs” (see column 5, lines 47-53).

As to claims 8 and 19, Kim includes all of the limitations set forth in them, but does not disclose a single content-based specification set. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a single content-based specification set for the sake of simplicity, i.e., requiring the user to go through less steps when configuring his preferences.

As to claim 9, Kim discloses a “restriction menu screen” (column 5, line 57) through which the user selects the specification set he desires.

As to claim 11, Kim discloses that a “password” (column 4, line 23) is to be entered when the user modifies and/or selects a preset specification set.

Art Unit: 2614

As to claim 12, Kim discloses that a “user’s identification” (column 4, line 61) is to be used when modifying or selecting a rating code, whose operation is affected as described in columns 4-5, lines 65-6.

As to claims 13 and 14, Kim discloses a memory component where the rating codes are stored, which is either “random access memory or non-volatile memory” (column 4, lines 24-25). The memory is an integral part of the device, thus permanent. Modification and selection of the desired rating code is done via a “macro function key” (column 4, line 22). As it is well known in the art, macros are sequences of computer instructions that get inserted into a program during execution or compilation (essentially, mini-programs). The control section compares the received rating code with the preset rating code and blocks the program signal accordingly. The control section is controlled by a “micro-computer” (column 4, line 34), which, upon determination of what action should be taken, “executes an operation” (column 5, line 64) and generates the appropriate control signal. A blocking signal is generated when “the rating code of the received program is out of scope of the preset rating code” (columns 6-7, lines 66-1). Kim does not explicitly disclose, “one or more preset content-based specification sets preset by the manufacturer.” However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kim such that one or more preset content-based specification sets are preset by the manufacturer for the same reasons as described above in claim 1.

As to claims 15-18, they are rejected based on the same criteria used to reject claims 4-7, respectively.

Art Unit: 2614

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, in view of Elam (USPN 6,216,263), cited by the examiner.

As to claim 10, Kim includes all of the limitations set forth in claim 10, but does not disclose a dedicated function key. Elam however, discloses a "designation panel" (column 5, line 6), with "push-button switches which when depressed designate respective program content categories" (column 5, lines 10-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kim's apparatus with Elam's teachings so that a preset content-based specification set could be selected with a dedicated function key in order to make the user's preferences configuration process faster and easier.

7. Claims 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collings (USPN 5,828,402), cited by the examiner.

As to claim 20, Collings discloses an apparatus for selectively blocking A/V signals. The apparatus comprises of "non-volatile memory" (column 11, line 40), which is an integral part of the apparatus, thus permanent, and a logic unit (element 42) coupled to the non-volatile memory as can be seen from Figure 2. The unit detects the rating and subject matter category from the transmitted signal, compares it with "user preferences stored in memory" (column 3, line 6), and generates an appropriate control signal which either blocks or passes the transmitted program signal. Collings discloses a non-volatile memory 58 for storing one or more preset content-based specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category (see col. 17, lines 33 – col. 18, line 4). Collings does not explicitly disclose the one or more preset content-based

Art Unit: 2614

specification sets are preset by the manufacturer. Collings does not specifically disclose, “permanent nonvolatile memory comprising one or more preset content–based specification sets preset by the manufacturer, each of the preset content–based specification sets comprising a rating and a subject matter category.” However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Collings such that one or more preset content–based specification sets [would have been] preset by the manufacturer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to make such a modification since many consumer electronics devices come manufactured with present content-based specification sets already stored in permanent memory, such as a ROM, EEPROM, or other type of permanent memory.

As to claims 21 and 26, the reference discloses an output device comprising of elements 39 and 34 as can be seen from Figure 2.

As to claim 22, Collings discloses a “remote control transmitter” (column 16, line 25), a “receiver” (column 16, line 22), and an “on screen display generator” (column 16, lines 22-23), which are used as a configuration entry system by the user.

As to claim 23, Collings clearly discloses a “data slicer” (column 8, line 51), which detects and extracts “one or more embedded codes in video signal” (column 3, lines 62-63).

As to claims 24 and 25, Collings discloses “switching means” (column 3, line 46), which can be in the form of “electromechanical relays or electronic switches” (column 3, line 51), or “apparatus which can selectively degrade signal, or add noise to signal” (column 3, lines 56-57), i.e., a scrambler.

As to claim 27, Collings discloses that the non-volatile memory can be "ROM" (column 11, line 43).

As to claim 28, Collings discloses a "microprocessor" (column 8, line 35), which controls the operation of the apparatus.

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis, in view of Kim.

As to claim 33, Abecassis discloses that a number of other available rating systems may be implemented (col. 8, lines 37-40). Abecassis does not specifically disclose a television rating set. Kim teaches a television rating set as shown in Fig. 11. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Abecassis to further include a television content-based indicator set as taught by Kim. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to make such a modification since it would be advantageous to use a television content-based indicator set, especially, when viewing television broadcast programs.

9. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis, in view of Elam.

As to claim 38, Abecassis includes all of the limitations set forth in claim 38, but does not disclose a dedicated function key. Elam however, discloses a "designation panel" (column 5, line 6), with "push-button switches which when depressed designate respective program content categories" (column 5, lines 10-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 2614

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abecassis' apparatus with Elam's teachings so that a preset content-based specification set could be selected with a dedicated function key in order to make the user's preferences configuration process faster and easier.

10. Claims 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis.

As to claim 37, Abecassis includes all of the limitations set forth in them, but does not disclose a single content-based specification set. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a single content-based specification set for the sake of simplicity, i.e., requiring the user to go through less steps when configuring his preferences.

As to claim 40, Abecassis discloses that selection of the preset content based specification set is affected in response to entry of a valid passcode (col. 8, lines 37-40). Abecassis does not specifically disclose entry of valid user information. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to use user information in addition to, or in place of pass codes or passwords for access to restricted system settings for the advantage of providing more secure access to a system, while making it easier for the user to remember their own access information by using personal information. Therefore, it is submitted that it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use valid user information for access to selecting a content-based specification set for the advantages given above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael W. Hoyer whose telephone number is (703) 305-6954.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller, can be reached at (703) 305-4795

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Michael W. Hoyer
July 27, 2003


JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600